Entanglement Detection with Fewer Measurements based on the Geometric Criterion

Bingjie Wang
Computer Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB3 0FD, United Kingdom and
Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo N2L 3G1, Canada

Stephen Brierley
DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom
(Dated: September 14, 2016)

We present a new technique to reduce the expected number of measurements to declare an unknown quantum state as entangled. Our method is based on the geometric criterion and so requires only local Pauli measurements. Using concentration of measure, we provide a heuristic which allows us to reinterpret a previous decision tree algorithm due to Laskowski *et al* and that forms the basis for our new algorithm. Numerical simulations show that for three to six qubits we use fewer measurements than either the trivial algorithm or the decision tree algorithm. In addition, our method is easy to construct, assumes no prior knowledge of the system and works for any number of qubits.

arXiv:1602.02099v2 [quant-ph] 12 Sep 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Given a source producing copies of an unknown quantum system, ρ, how does one best prove that the state is entangled, if indeed it is? A natural approach is to perform full state tomography which can reveal entanglement in any state using for example, positive but not completely positive maps [1, 2]. However, the number of measurements required grows exponentially with the system size and quickly becomes unreasonable. Alternatively, entanglement witnesses can reveal entanglement with only a single measurement but when ρ is unknown, we are unlikely to choose a good witness to measure.

Here, we address the question of detection *efficiency*: we seek to minimize the expected number of measurements needed to detect that an unknown (mixed) state is entangled. We use the geometric criterion as it has several appealing properties: (1) The criterion requires only local measurements of Pauli operators and (2) it is good at detecting entanglement in unknown states, that is, no prior information about ρ is needed. We propose a structured search algorithm which we call the *stream algorithm* that reduces the expected number of measurements needed to detect entanglement using the geometric criterion. An application of Levy's lemma provides a motivating heuristic and numerical simulations demonstrate that our algorithm out-performs a previous approach due to Laskowski et al. [3, 4] which is based on correlation complementarity [5].

The Pauli matrices form a basis of Hermitian matrices and so any N qubit density matrix can be expressed as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{a_1,\cdots,a_N=0}^{3} T_{a_1\cdots a_N} \sigma_{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{a_N} \qquad (1)$$

where $\{\sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_3\}$ are the usual Pauli matrices plus the identity matrix. The coefficients $T_{a_1\cdots a_N} = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(\sigma_{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{a_N})]$ are refereed to as the components of the *correlation tensor*. Throughout the paper, we write strings of indices using Greek letters $\alpha = a_1 \cdots a_N$ for notational convenience. The *geometric criterion* [6] states that if a state, ρ, satisfies the condition

$$\sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma} T_\alpha^2 > 1\,, \qquad (2)$$

where $\Sigma = \{1, 2, 3\}^N$, then it is entangled. For pure states, that is, $\rho = |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$, this criterion is also necessary.

The starting point for our paper and that of Laskowski *et al* is that one can declare the state entangled as soon as the threshold is exceeded. It is not necessary to measure the remaining values of T_α.

Correlation complementarity [5] states that given a set, $S = \{\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k\}$, of mutually anti-commuting observables with eigenvalues ± 1, we have

$$\sum_{\alpha\in S} T_\alpha^2 \leq 1\,. \qquad (3)$$

Thus, if a given correlation is large, $|T_\alpha| \geq 0.5$ say, the observables which anti-commute with α are likely to have small correlations. Laskowski *et al* use this idea to construct a decision tree, which we call the *tree algorithm*. Each node of the tree represents the measurement of T_α for some α and, conditional on the outcome, tells the user where to move next. Unlike traditional decision trees, which are constructed with machine learning strategies, Laskowski *et al* construct the tree analytically: if T_α is large, we target the next element in the current mutually commuting subset. Otherwise, we target an unmeasured element of a new mutually commuting subset. We reformulate the tree algorithm in Sec II.

Given a large T_α, the tree algorithm requires fewer measurements compared to a random order of measurements. The first advantage of the stream algorithm is that it removes the requirement that the experimenter has already found a large T_α. Even given a large T_α, we find that the stream algorithm out-performs the tree algorithm for 3 to 6 qubits in Sec. IV.

In general, the state, ρ, produced by the source is described by a single mixed state and the degree of purity in the state will dictate how much of an improvement

one would expect over a random choice of measurements (and indeed whether or not the state is entangled). Thus, thought the paper, we only consider the performance of the measurement strategies against pure states. In addition, we sample ρ according to the Haar measure since this is equivalent to saying that the experimenter knows nothing about ρ at the beginning of the experiment.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we argue that as the number of qubits increases, the driving heuristic is not correlation complementarity. Instead, violating the geometric criterion should be seen as a search for unusually large terms and the goal to derive an algorithm that conducts an organized search. This leads to an alternative view of the tree algorithm and allows us to derive an improved algorithm using the computer science construct of a stream.

We present a numerical experiment to provide intuition for our above claim. First, we sample 10,000 states and compute the sample mean, μ, and sample standard deviation, σ, of $|T_{11\cdots1}|$. Note: as the samples are from a Haar-uniform source, all $|T_\alpha|$s are identically distributed. Then, we can examine the sample mean of $\max_\alpha|T_\alpha|$ as an indication of the predictive value of searching for the largest correlation. To assess correlation complementarity as a heuristic, we sample states, post-selecting on $|T_{11\cdots1}| \geq 0.5$, until 10,000 states are obtained. We then compute the sample means of a correlation that commutes with $\sigma_{11\cdots1}$, $|T_{11\cdots122}|$, and one that anti-commutes, $|T_{11\cdots12}|$. These two sample means provide an indication of the predictive value of correlation complementarity.

We would like to compare these indications of predictive value as the number of qubits increases. The statistical tool for doing so is the z-score (or standard score), $z(x) = (x-\mu)/\sigma$, which normalizes the results. It is clear from Table I that the predictive value of correlation complementarity becomes weaker, whereas that of searching for unusually large terms becomes stronger.

Qubits	μ	σ	$\mu(z_{\max})$	$\mu(z_+)$	$\mu(z_-)$
2	0.377	0.243	1.624	+0.183	−0.296
3	0.273	0.190	2.209	+0.193	−0.236
4	0.197	0.142	2.831	+0.161	−0.210
5	0.140	0.102	3.452	+0.167	−0.204
6	0.100	0.074	4.044	+0.146	−0.207

TABLE I: The results of the numerical experiment for 2-6 qubits. μ and σ are the sample mean and standard deviation of $|T_{11\cdots1}|$ respectively. $\mu(|z_{\max}|)$ is the sample mean of the z-score of $\max_\alpha|T_\alpha|$. $\mu(z_+)$ and $\mu(z_-)$ are the sample means of the z-score of a commuting and anti-commuting (with $\sigma_{11\cdots1}$, whose correlation is known to be large) correlation respectively. Note: events with $z \geq 4.0$ are extremely rare, with odds of 1:15,000.

The observed behaviour can be explained using concentration of measure. Let f be a function from $S^k \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, where S^k is a k-dimensional real sphere. If X is drawn uniformly from S^k and f has Lipschitz constant η and median $m(f)$, then Levy's Lemma [7, 8] states that

$$p(|f(X) - m(f)| > \varepsilon) \leq \exp[-(k-1)\varepsilon^2/(2\pi^2\eta^2)]$$

We designate $f_\alpha(|\varphi\rangle) = \mathrm{Tr}[|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|\sigma_\alpha] = T_\alpha$ and apply Levy's Lemma. A unit vector, $|\varphi\rangle$, on a 2^N-dimensional complex sphere can be mapped to a 2^{N+1}-dimensional real sphere by breaking each entry into its real and imaginary components. It is simple to show that the mean $m(f_\alpha) = 0$. The square of the maximum gradient is given by $\eta^2 = \sup(\nabla f_\alpha)^\dagger(\nabla f_\alpha)$ which we calculate as follows. Differentiating with respect to the real and imaginary variables, we have

$$\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \,\mathrm{Re}\,|\varphi_m\rangle} = 2\,\mathrm{Re}\sum_j \sigma_{mj}|\varphi_j\rangle$$
$$\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \,\mathrm{Im}\,|\varphi_m\rangle} = -2i\,\mathrm{Im}\sum_j \sigma_{mj}|\varphi_j\rangle\,,$$

so that,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\nabla f_\alpha)^\dagger(\nabla f_\alpha) \\
&= \sum_i \left(\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \mathrm{Re}(|\varphi_i\rangle)}\right)^* \left(\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \mathrm{Re}(|\varphi_i\rangle)}\right) + \\
&\qquad \left(\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \mathrm{Im}(|\varphi_i\rangle)}\right)^* \left(\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \mathrm{Im}(|\varphi_i\rangle)}\right) \\
&= 4\sum_{i,j,k} \mathrm{Re}(\sigma_{ik}|\varphi_k\rangle)\,\mathrm{Re}(\sigma_{ij}|\varphi_j\rangle) + \mathrm{Im}(\sigma_{ik}|\varphi_k\rangle)\,\mathrm{Im}(\sigma_{ij}|\varphi_j\rangle) \\
&= 4\cdot\mathrm{Tr}\left[|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|(\sigma_\alpha)^2\right] = 4\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus Levy's lemma yields

$$p(|T_\alpha| > \varepsilon) \leq \exp\left[-(2^{N+1}-1)\varepsilon^2/(8\pi^2)\right]\,. \qquad (4)$$

As the number of qubits increases, $|T_\alpha|$ is concentrated around 0. However, if a state is entangled, the geometric criterion applies. To reconcile Eq. 4 with Eq. 2, we expect unusually large correlations in entangled states.

Up to a basis change, we now present an equivalent view of the decision tree algorithm of Laskowski *et al.*. A large correlation T_γ is assumed to be known in advance. Let $C_\gamma = \{\alpha \mid \sigma_\alpha \text{ and } \sigma_\gamma \text{ commute}\}$. We find the maximal subsets of mutually commuting operators in C_γ. Within such a subset, Q_i, the strings can be ordered lexicographically. We also order the subset label, i, lexicographically. Let S be the sorted version of Q, with $S_{i,j}$ denoting the j-th element of the i-th ordered-set.

The algorithm is as follows, start at $S_{0,0}$. If $S_{i,j}$ is measured and the correlation is large, then move onto $S_{i,j+1}$. Otherwise, find the smallest k such that $S_{i,j} \neq S_{k,j}$. If j is the first point where S_i and S_k differ (*i.e.*,

$\forall l < j.\ S_{i,l} = S_{k,l}$), then move onto $S_{k,j}$. Otherwise, we compute priorities for every unmeasured observable:

$$p_\alpha = \sum_{\alpha,\beta \text{anti-commute}} \hat{T}_\beta^2 \tag{5}$$

where $\hat{T}_\beta = T_\beta$ if β has been measured and 0 otherwise. Measure correlations in ascending order of priority.

Now, consider the commutation graph $G = (V, E)$ with $V = C_\gamma$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in E$ if and only if σ_α and σ_β commute. A *clique* is a set $Q \subseteq V$ such that there is an edge between every $\alpha, \beta \in Q$. A clique, Q, is said to be maximal if there is no clique Q' such that $Q \subset Q'$. It is simple to show that the maximal cliques of G correspond to the maximal subsets of mutually commuting operators. Thus, the tree algorithm conducts an organized search of the operators in C_γ for unusually large correlations through the use of maximal cliques.

III. THE STREAM ALGORITHM

An important problem with the decision tree construction of Laskowski *et al* is that it assumes we have already found a large correlation. Laskowski *et al* suggest methods of finding this starting point [4], but they do not work well for three qubits ($\approx 67\%$ success) and completely fail for five or more qubits [4].

A secondary concern is the computational cost of finding maximal cliques. The Max-Clique problem is one of Karp's 21 famous NP-Complete problems [9]. Solutions for more than 6 qubits cannot be obtained through ordinary computing resources and solutions for more than 8 qubits cannot be obtained at all. While solutions may be efficiently without resolving $\mathsf{P} \stackrel{?}{=} \mathsf{NP}$, currently, we can do little better than the $O[3^{|V|}]$ algorithm by Tomita, Tanaka, and Takahashi [10].

A stream captures the concept of a production line. Informally, streams are like queues, except they can be filtered and can have infinite length (See Paulson's book [11], for a more formal treatment).

Notationally, the overall stream is $\mathcal{S}$ and the iteration's stream is $\mathcal{I}$. Then the *stream algorithm* is as follows:

1. Initialise $\mathcal{S}$ with the elements of $\Sigma = \{1, 2, 3\}^N$.
2. During each iteration, the algorithm seeks a large T_γ. Laskowski *et al*'s choice of threshold: $|T_\gamma| \geq 0.5$ [4] is also used here. Despite different μ and σ for different numbers of qubits, as seen in Sec. II, the algorithm's performance is insensitive to the choice of threshold.
   (a) Start the iteration by copying the elements of $\mathcal{S}$ into $\mathcal{I}$.
   (b) Let α be the first item in $\mathcal{I}$. Measure T_α and pop α from $\mathcal{I}$. If $|T_\alpha|$ is large, then break the iteration. If not, remove all β such that σ_β and σ_α commute from $\mathcal{I}$.
   (c) If $\mathcal{I}$ is empty, remember the largest T_α seen during the iteration and break the iteration.
3. Let T_α be the large correlation (or the largest correlation seen during the iteration). Remove α and all β such that σ_β and σ_α anti-commute from $\mathcal{S}$ and return to step 2.
4. If $\mathcal{S}$ is empty, measure the remaining observables according to the priority given in Eq. (5).

The stream and tree algorithms are related. Brute force shows that the stream algorithm recommends the same sequence of measurements as the tree algorithm. Although, this is not true in larger systems.

The stream algorithm is a "greedy" approach to finding maximal cliques. It finds large, but not necessarily maximal, cliques and searches through them. While this is an approximation, it does not require a large correlation to be known in advance and is not difficult to construct. The key step of the algorithm is removing the commuting observables in step 2 (b). The intuition is: suppose T_α is measured and is small, then T_β is measured and is large, and the tree construction is followed. If σ_α and σ_β commute, then α would be in the decision tree, despite having been measured. This behaviour should be avoided, so σ_β should anti-commute with σ_α.

IV. PERFORMANCE

We compare the performance of the algorithms using numerical simulations for systems of three to six qubits. We do not examine the two qubit case as the stream and tree algorithms are equivalent there. The simulation generates 1,000 test states, runs the appropriate algorithms on the test states, and records how many measurements were needed to surpass the 1.0 threshold in Eq. 2.

The first simulation we implement compares the stream algorithm and a random order of measurements on Haar random pure states. As noted in the introduction, sampling according to the Haar measure imposes that we have no information about the state ρ at the start of the experiment the degree of purity, $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho)$ dictates how much of an improvement one would expect to see for *any* ordering of measurements. In the second test, we compare the stream and tree algorithms together with random. In order to do so, we post-select on $|T_{11\cdots1}| \geq 0.5$ so that the input states are no longer Haar random. Post-selection is favourable to the tree algorithm, as it provides the starting point for free. For a fair comparison, the random strategy starts with $T_{11\cdots1}$.

The results are summarized using the average number of measurements taken. Table II presents this summary. The stream algorithm outperforms the tree algorithm in every setting. Furthermore, the stream algorithm's edge over the tree algorithm and random increases with the number of qubits. The results of the post-selection test are presented in further detail in Fig. 1 by plotting the number of states detected after k measurements.



FIG. 1: The number of states detected after k steps for the random algorithm, stream algorithm, and tree algorithm for (a) three qubits, (b) four qubits (c) five qubits, and (d) six qubits. Note the sigmoid shape of the plots; this is because the search-problem aspect of violating the geometric criterion is similar to the birthday paradox.

	Haar Random		Post-Selected		
Qubits	Stream	Random	Stream	Tree	Random
3	7.7	+1.4	4.8	+0.1	+2.1
4	14.8	+2.1	9.4	+0.5	+3.6
5	28.3	+5.4	18.2	+1.8	+7.1
6	56.9	+8.6	35.0	+2.6	+13.6

TABLE II: The average number of measurements for the stream, tree, and random algorithms in the numerical experiments. The values for tree and random are given relative to the stream algorithm's performance.

V. CONCLUSION

We use concentration of measure to present entanglement detection as a structured search problem. This insight is used to build the stream algorithm, which outperforms a random choice of measurements and a previous decision tree algorithm of Laskowski *et al* for three to six qubits. In effect, our algorithm reduces the experimental cost of implementing the geometric criterion by around $10 - 15\%$ for the range we have examined. In addition, the stream algorithm is easy to construct and requires no prior knowledge of the system.

[1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys **81**, 865 (2009).
[2] O. Guhne and G. Toth, Physics Reports **474**, 1 (2009).
[3] W. Laskowski, D. Richart, C. Schwemmer, T. Paterek, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 240501 (2012).
[4] W. Laskowski, C. Schwemmer, D. Richart, L. Knips, T. Paterek, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 022327 (2013).
[5] P. Kurzyński, T. Paterek, R. Ramanathan, W. Laskowski, and D. Kaszlikowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 180402 (2011).
[6] P. Badziag, C. Brukner, W. Laskowski, T. Paterek, and M. Żukowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 140403 (2008).
[7] P. Hayden, D. W. Leung, and A. Winter, Commun. Math. Phys. **265**, 95 (2006).
[8] M. Ledoux, *The Concentration of Measure Phenomenon*, 89 (American Mathematical Society, 2005), ISBN 9780821837924.
[9] R. M. Karp, in *Complexity of Computer Computations* (Springer U.S., 1972), pp. 85–103, ISBN 978-1-4684-2003-6.
[10] E. Tomita, A. Tanaka, and H. Takahashi, Theor. Comput. Sci. **363**, 28 (2006).
[11] L. C. Paulson, *ML for the Working Programmer* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), ISBN 0-521-56543-X.